

## **Historic, Archive Document**

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.



EXTENSION SERVICE

# REVIEW

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE \* NOVEMBER 1967



*The Extension Service Review is for Extension educators—in County, State, and Federal Extension agencies—who work directly or indirectly to help people learn how to use the newest findings in agriculture and home economics research to bring about a more abundant life for themselves and their communities.*

*The Review offers the Extension worker, in his role of educational leader, professional guideposts, new routes and tools for speedier, more successful endeavor. Through this exchange of methods, tried and found successful by Extension agents, the Review serves as a source of ideas and useful information on how to reach people and thus help them utilize more fully their own resources, to farm more efficiently, and to make the home and community a better place to live.*

**ORVILLE L. FREEMAN**  
*Secretary of Agriculture*

**LLOYD H. DAVIS, Administrator**  
*Federal Extension Service*

Prepared in  
Information Services  
Federal Extension Service, USDA  
Washington, D. C. 20250

**Director: Walter John**  
**Editor: W. J. Whorton**  
**Assistant Editor: Mary Ann White**

The Extension Service Review is published monthly by direction of the Secretary of Agriculture as administrative information required for the proper transaction of the public business. Use of funds for printing this publication approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (July 1, 1963).

The Review is issued free by law to workers engaged in Extension activities. Others may obtain copies from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 20402, at 15 cents per copy or by subscription at \$1.50 a year, domestic, and \$2.25, foreign.

Reference to commercial products and services is made with the understanding that no discrimination is intended and no endorsement by the Department of Agriculture is implied.

## EXTENSION SERVICE

# REVIEW

*Official monthly publication of Cooperative Extension Service; U. S. Department of Agriculture and State Land-Grant Colleges and Universities cooperating.*

CONTENTS	Page
Dial 946-7771	3
Higher Yields, Better Conservation	4
Iowa's 'Open Farm'	6
Rapid Adjustment Yields Rewards	8
Education/Organization	10
City Youth Visit the Farm	12
Homemaking Unlimited	14
From the Administrator's Desk	16

*The cover: Extension educational programs make the results of agricultural research readily available to the farmer.*

## Keep 'em Coming!

We appreciate the many fine letters you send us regarding your magazine—the Extension Service Review. Your comments, suggestions, and story tips all assist in planning the content of the various issues.

One comment that is received regularly, however not too frequently, is, "Why does the Extension Service Review promote the production of specific crops or commodities?" This comment is always made in reference to a story built around a specific crop or commodity. We feel this deserves a public answer.

Let me cite excerpts from the legend in the upper left corner of this page which states the purpose of the Review: "The Review offers . . . professional guide-posts, new routes and tools . . . serves as a source of ideas and useful information on how to reach people . . ."

We seek to fulfill these purposes by showing the application and effectiveness of specific educational techniques in a real-life experience and when possible told by the Extension workers directly involved. The fact that a story shows educational techniques applied to the growing of flax, mint, eggs, or pigeons is irrelevant. We do try to select stories containing educational techniques that have relevancy to a broad range of Extension programs. We do attempt through overall magazine content, in a general way, to reflect major emphases and concerns of Extension.

So keep the suggestions and comments coming. It's your magazine and the more comment we get—the better we are attuned to your needs and desires.—WJW





by  
Edward Gregory  
*County Extension Director  
Oklahoma County, Oklahoma*

Just as families in Oklahoma County, Oklahoma, dial for the correct time or the day's weather, they can now dial for latest tips on horticulture. To get current tips on gardening or caring for home grounds, they pick up the telephone and dial 946-7771.

The information is available any hour, seven days a week. This is possible because Hugh Hedger, horticulturist at the OSU Extension Center, is putting timely tips on telephone tapes

as a new service for residents of the Oklahoma City metropolitan area.

Persons dialing hear 60- to 90-second spots giving such hints as, "last call for planting cool season grasses," "make your plans now for planting spring blooming bulbs," and "repot house plants that have been out all summer."

Also included are dates for flower shows, reminders of the monthly hor-

ticulture lectures, and other information of horticultural interest.

The first message, for example, explained types of grass to plant in shady areas and ways to get home grounds ready for winter. Hedger also announced a State Rose Show that was going on that Sunday. Another spot concerned the problem of diseases of oak trees.

Oklahoma County folks like their new service. As a result of 35 newspaper announcements describing the Dial-A-Tip service, the Oklahoma City office has averaged more than eight calls per hour on a 24-hour basis. On an 8-hour count, calls have not dropped below 15 per hour since the service began more than a month ago.

"This is the finest thing that has happened for Oklahoma City for the home owner," reported one garden club member. "I have not missed a day in dialing."

The idea for the Dial-A-Tip service originated when Hedger heard about the use of a similar service by an agent in Worcester, Massachusetts. Oklahoma County Extension staff members wrote for more information and consulted the county Extension director on the idea, but the budget would not cover the expense.

Inquiry revealed, however, that several businesses and the Oklahoma City Garden Clubs were willing to sponsor the project. The garden clubs were chosen as the sponsors because they are a non-profit organization. They are financing the service on a 12-month contract.

If calls continue at the present rate, the telephone company will install the number of machines necessary to take care of calls and cut down the number of busy signals.

Hugh Hedger and Oklahoma County Extension Director Edward Gregory believe there is no better way than this to put horticultural information at the fingertips of Oklahoma County's 500,000 residents. Gregory says, "This is just one of a whole series of pioneering efforts to reach our urban population effectively with relevant information." □

# Higher Yields, Better Conservation

through Illinois Extension  
minimum tillage program

by  
**Robert D. Walker**  
*Soil Conservation Specialist*  
*Illinois Extension Service*  
and  
**Wendell Bowers**  
*Agricultural Engineer*  
*Oklahoma Extension Service*



*Using a chisel plow instead of moldboard plow leaves a substantial portion of the crop residuals on the surface to reduce wind and water erosion.*

Prior to 1950, it was not unusual for Illinois corn growers to make 10 to 12 trips over a field before completing their tillage operations. The trend toward increased tillage was brought about by the development of larger and faster equipment. Farmers used the time saved to make more trips, believing that more tillage insured a better seed bed.

In the early fifties two things happened almost simultaneously that triggered most of the research work that was done on minimum tillage: 1) farmers started raising questions about

such things as soil erosion, wind erosion, and compaction; and 2) the cost-price squeeze meant that each tillage trip could be challenged from the standpoint of cost.

A research project to help determine the minimum amount of tillage needed for growing corn was started by H. P. Bateman on the Agricultural Engineering Research Farm at Urbana in 1952.

He compared four basic minimum tillage treatments with conventional planting: plow and plant as one op-

eration with a planter mounted on the plow; plow, then plant with no intermediate tillage; plow, then plant in press-wheel or tractor wheel tracks; plow and pull a light tillage tool such as a clodbuster, harrow, or rotary hoe section, then plant.

Eight plow plant comparisons were set up on farmers' fields in 1956 with the cooperation of county agricultural agents. Results indicated that tillage yields could be expected to equal conventional tillage yields on most Illinois soils.

While work to this point had been





*Soil movement by wind has occurred more often in recent years on Illinois' level prairie lands because of the removal of hedge fence rows, more fall plowing, and larger fields.*

primarily research, the field trials had also served as a demonstration program for minimum tillage. On the basis of the field work, Extension developed a 16mm sound movie, "Minimum Tillage," which was used for many types of meetings.

With the development of a slide set and circular in 1961, responsibility for conducting the minimum tillage program shifted from the State Extension staff to county agricultural agents and vocational agriculture teachers. More than 300 copies of the slide set were distributed.

The Extension educational program did not promote the extreme forms of minimum tillage used in research work, but encouraged farmers to reduce tillage to the lowest practical number of trips across the field on their particular farms. The objective in each case was to achieve quick germination or high percent of germination, and maximum yields. Thus, minimum tillage, rather than being one particular method, was a principle which could be applied in many different ways.

Working with county agents and machinery company representatives, Wendell Bowers, Extension agricultural engineer, organized State minimum tillage field days in 1964 and 1965. County Extension agents arranged for a farm on which machinery

companies could demonstrate their minimum tillage equipment. The Illinois Extension editorial office publicized the event statewide through news releases, radio programs, and posters.

Weather conditions prevented actual equipment operation both years, but approximately 1,000 farmers attended each year to look over available equipment and talk to machinery company representatives.

Extension workers in Illinois estimate that 90 percent of the State's farmers have adopted and are using minimum tillage in varying degrees. Adoption of the practice in extreme forms, however, is still quite limited.

One of the measures of the rate of adoption is the increased sales of chisel plows. In very recent years, annual sales of chisel plows have increased several hundred percent. The chisel plow is used extensively in minimum tillage operations.

Since farmers in counties with average land slopes of less than 3 percent had been slow in adopting other conservation practices, the State conservation people began to look to minimum tillage as a valuable erosion control practice.

Illinois conservationists have been looking for wind and water erosion control practices that farmers will use with their modern farming methods.

Certain forms of minimum tillage have been recognized as good erosion control practices for some time.

Research has shown that soil erosion losses from water may be reduced 40 percent with plow plant or wheel track plant systems. Mulch tillage systems are also effective in controlling both wind and water erosion.

In 1967, the Illinois ASCS office received Washington approval for an ACP "conservation tillage" practice (those forms of minimum tillage that are effective in controlling water and wind erosion). Ten counties, representing all sections of the State, were selected to try the "conservation tillage" practice on a limited basis.

Two training meetings were held for leaders in the pilot counties including county Extension agents, Soil Conservation Service work unit conservationists, the Soil Conservation District boards, county ASCS office managers, and county ASC committees.

Each county selected about 12 farmers who use a variety of conservation tillage practices, including plow plant, wheel track plant, mulch tillage, or no tillage (chemically killed soil).

Payment rates are \$3.50 per acre without contouring and \$5 per acre with contouring, not to exceed \$500 total conservation tillage payment per farmer. Contour farming or farming parallel with terraces is required on land with more than 2 percent slope.

Tours with good attendance were held last summer by all 10 counties to show the results with tillage systems used. More than 60 Illinois counties have been approved for "conservation tillage" practice in 1968. Each county will again be limited to approximately 12 cooperators. □



*Among those who cooperated to make the Clinton County "open farm" a success were, left to right, A. W. Poffenberger, Clinton banker; Paul Hofer, owner of the exhibition farm; and Norman J. Goodwin, Clinton County Extension Director.*

## Iowa's 'Open Farm'

tells agriculture's story  
to widespread  
urban audience

by  
John L. Sears  
and  
Norman J. Goodwin\*

Something new in rural-urban understanding took place in Clinton County, Iowa, when 1,200 people attended an "open farm" sponsored by the County Agricultural Extension Council.

Visitors were registered from 91 towns in 26 States and from Germany and Costa Rica. Sixty-six different occupations were listed by those who attended.

The phrase "open farm" was derived from the traditional "open house"—but in this case an entire farming operation was open to the public for inspection.

*\*Sears, public information chairman, National Association of County Agricultural Agents; Goodwin, county Extension director, Clinton County, Iowa.*



The first of its kind in eastern Iowa, the event gave townspeople an idea of what farm life is all about and better informed suburbanites of the overall role agriculture plays in their daily lives.

The farm on exhibition was located five miles east of DeWitt, Iowa, on U.S. Route 30, a major East-West highway. The farm owner, Paul Hofer, is a member of the Mississippi Valley Farm Business Association who keeps accurate records of his farm operation. He is an excellent hog farmer and beef feeder, and has outstanding corn yields. The Hofer farm is a good example of Clinton County farming, since beef, hogs, and corn are the most important agricultural enterprises in the county.

Hofer owns 160 of the farm's 280 acres and rents the rest. The 180 acres of land which is planted in corn each year averages about 125 bushels per acre. He has 25 acres of oats and 20 acres of soybeans. The rest of the land is in hay, pasture, farmstead, and roads.

Hofer raised 90 litters of pigs last year, averaging 8.9 pigs per litter—one of the reasons he was selected an Iowa Master Swine Producer. About 93 percent of his hogs graded No. 1.

Hofer's total capital managed in the operation last year was \$210,000. Land improvement inventory was \$124,000, livestock and feed inventory was \$63,000, and machinery and equipment inventory was \$23,000.

The Hofer family is typical of Clinton County farm families. Paul and Elaine have three children at home and two older children who are married. The family participates in many agricultural and community affairs.

Paul is vice president of the Clinton County Pork Producers Association, past president of the Clinton-Jackson 100-Bushel Corn Club, a member of the Mississippi Valley Farm Business Administration, the county Farm Bureau, the county Beef Producers Association, and the 4-H Club show committee.

The "open farm" idea originated

with the Community and Public Affairs Committee. They presented the suggestion to the Extension Council, who in turn asked Extension to include it in their 1967 program.

With Hofer's cooperation, Extension made plans for visitors to tour the various farm operations. Visitors saw beef cattle nearly ready for market, feeder cattle which had recently been started on feed, and the automatic beef cattle feeding setup.

Also on display was a complete hog operation from baby pigs to hogs ready for market, including farrowing stalls, growing section, and finishing pens. They also saw the actual combining of the oats crop and noted the progress of the corn crop.

The Hofer boys were on hand to demonstrate how they care for, fit, and groom their 4-H swine and beef projects.

The associate county Extension agent discussed the beef program at the feed lot; Hofer's feed dealer, who is also an excellent cooperater in the Extension program, discussed the hog operation.

Extension arranged for wagon trains to take visitors to the cornfield, where the fertilizer dealer discussed the crops program, fertilizers, and insecticides. The local farm implement dealer, with whom Hofer works closely, discussed the various machines that were on display in the yard.

The information presented during the open farm was not highly technical, but dealt mainly with basic information for an urban audience unfamiliar with farming. However, the discussion did include some technical aspects concerning cross-fertilization of corn; use of fertilizer, insecticides, and herbicides; and details of the feeding program and costs of the various operations.

The Clinton County Beef Committee served barbecued beef samples, and the Pork Committee barbecued one of Hofer's prize hogs on a spit in the farm yard. Coffee and milk were served by the Clinton Chamber of Commerce, with whom Extension has a close working relationship. The

county Extension home economist helped organize the serving of refreshments.

The county agent presided at the loudspeaker to see that everything kept moving on time and to call attention to the various features of the farm. Prior to the event, he prepared a brochure describing the Hofer family and their farm operation.

It explained some of the costs involved and how they relate to the final market price, described Clinton County agriculture, and outlined the contributions that agriculture makes to the economy. Extension office assistants distributed the brochures to visitors at the open farm.

The agent also prepared two news releases during the two weeks preceding the event, which went to all the mass media in the State. Several newspapers carried articles, and radio and television stations also gave excellent coverage.

Other advance publicity included a large sign placed at the entrance of the farm about three weeks before the event, and a letter which the agent wrote to the members of the Pork Association and Beef Producer's Association encouraging them to bring a town couple.

Business cooperation was obtained through personal contact with the various businesses in the county, and also with service clubs. In addition to the personal contacts, Extension sent a letter of invitation to the bankers, feed dealers, fertilizer dealers, machinery and implement dealers, Labor Congress, service clubs, Chamber of Commerce, Junior Chamber of Commerce, and other county organizations.

The Clinton County open farm was a big step toward better understanding between farm and city—an illustration of what can result from an Extension program which originates with citizen planning, has the cooperation of local businesses and organizations, and is given the benefit of the right amount of well-timed publicity. □



*Alton Bailey, left, Alabama's farmer-of-the-year, and Charles Burns, county agricultural agent, inspect the swine facilities on Bailey's farm.*

## Rapid Adjustment Yields Rewards

**Alabama's top farmer follows Extension's recommendations to streamline production**

by  
Kenneth Copeland  
*Extension Magazine Editor*  
Auburn University  
Auburn, Alabama

consisted of 145 acres on which he produced wheat, corn, alfalfa, milk, and cotton.

Maddox introduced Bailey to linear programming—the use of a computer to determine what enterprise or combination of enterprises can give the optimum results. They submitted the farm resources—land, labor (Bailey and his wife manage the farm alone), and capital—to computer analysis. Bailey has followed to the letter the plan outlined for him.

On the basis of the computer analysis, Extension suggested that the Baileys go into volume production of either laying hens or hogs. They chose hogs, although the layers promised a bigger profit margin. Then followed a period of going deeper in debt. Bailey invested \$1,755 in a deep well; \$1,926 in a hog parlor; \$711 to convert a calf house into a farrowing house; \$506 for hog feeders; \$834 for 20 gilts and one boar; \$525 for lagoons and fencing; and \$120 for electrical

Alton Bailey, of Lauderdale County, Alabama, will tell you that Rapid Adjustment farming pays off—in higher production, more profits, and personal satisfaction.

His adherence to a Rapid Adjustment Farming Program has helped him increase his farm's net yearly profit five times in the past 6 years. It has also won him recognition as one of the State's top farmers.

The Rapid Adjustment Farm Program is conducted jointly in the Tennessee Valley States by land-grant universities and the Tennessee Valley Authority.

With the help of county Extension agents and State Extension specialists, farmers put the latest recommended production and management practices to work on their farms as soon as they are available. The farms move from their present condition to the point of maximum net income in as short a time as possible.

Alton Bailey is not a "big farmer"—as big farmers go these days. He owns and farms 194 acres, which he devotes to hogs, corn, and cotton. Before 1961, when Extension farm management specialist Charles Maddox entered the picture, his operation



installations. In addition, he later bought equipment to do the work in the fields.

By following Extension's Rapid Adjustment recommendations with the help of county agent Charles Burns and county Extension chairman L. T. Wagnon, Bailey has transformed his farm into a completely modern operation which is producing at peak efficiency.

His hogs are kept on concrete in a 60 x 30 foot feeding parlor from the time they are 5 weeks old until market day. One of the most practical, economical farrowing houses and finishing parlors in the country, the facility turns out up to 100 top slaughter hogs at a time. The parlor is divided into four sections, with feeders and waterers in each pen.

Pigs are farrowed in a separate farrowing house converted from a calf house. It accommodates 10 sows and has outside exercise pens and farrowing jackets. Pigs go into the feeding parlor at weaning time, and the sows go on pasture until farrowing time again.

Bailey's crib is equipped with conveyor belts which carry corn to the grinder mixer where he prepares an Extension-recommended ration. From the mixer, feed is mechanically conveyed into self-feeders. He grinds feed once a week.

The Baileys do everything themselves—from vaccinating their own pigs to washing sows before they are allowed in the farrowing areas. Mrs. Bailey drives one of their two tractors to speed up field work during rush seasons.

As a demonstration farm, Bailey's operation has become a model for others to follow in adjusting to the new livestock-crop type of combination farming in Alabama.

His farm has been visited by hundreds of farmers in this country and by agricultural leaders of the United States and several foreign countries.

Alton Bailey is a community leader, is ASCS community chairman, vice president of the county Hog Growers Association and a



*County agent Charles Burns assists the Baileys with their farm recordkeeping.*

Deacon in the local Baptist Church.

Bailey's participation in the Rapid Adjustment Program has won him personal satisfaction as well as financial awards. He was recently selected as the 1967 "Alabama Farmer," an award presented annually to an outstanding farmer in the State by the Alabama Farmer magazine.

The award which he received read: ". . . for outstanding achievement in agricultural production and for exemplifying to the highest degree the new era of the Alabama farm industry through the application of modern techniques in land use, management and production efficiency." □

*County agricultural agent Charles Burns explains Bailey's farm records to a group of foreign visitors.*





"Educational and organizational leadership" is a popular phrase regarding rural areas development and resource development. Secretary Freeman has designated this as Extension's role in the rural areas development movement.

Extension performance of these roles has been subjected to criticism, however, perhaps because neither Extension nor her sister agencies has fully understood how these relate to citizen planning for resource development with high involvement of other agency personnel and other professional assistance.

Planning for total resource development is more far-reaching than the traditional planning of Extension programs. It requires a coordinated approach by local citizens, agencies, organizations, and institutions to blueprint community change and social and economic progress.

It is founded on the concept that local citizens, given adequate facts and an understanding of them can make intelligent decisions toward directing community change. From citizen committees that pinpoint problem situations come specific recommendations for action and initiation of that action.

Well done, such recommendations encourage local organizations, institutions, agencies, and government units to develop programs that will assist in carrying out recommended action. The process goes far in insuring that the jigsaw pieces of progress are unified into an orderly pattern for community development.

Almost invariably the phrase "educational and organizational leadership" is presented as one term. Consequently, many Extension and other agency staffs consider it as a single idea. However, there are two basic ideas involved, and although they are inter-related, it is easy for the Extension staff to assume that they are executing both responsibilities by stressing only one.

Organizational leadership must involve education; nevertheless, the focus of such education is on estab-

## *What's the difference?*

# Education/Organization

by  
Gale VandeBerg  
*Dean, Economic and  
Environmental Development*  
and  
R. B. Schuster  
*Extension Resource Development  
Leader*  
*University of Wisconsin*

lishing and maintaining an effective ongoing organization. Education directed to this function may be quite different from the educational leadership in carrying out resource development.

There is a distinction between *planning for* resource development and developing resources; and between organizational leadership and educational leadership.

### **Organizational Leadership Role**

Inept or inadequate citizen committee planning activity is generally due to failure in the performance of the organizational role. This is not willful neglect on the part of the professional staff, but more likely a lack of understanding of the role. Without understanding and commitment, the role cannot be well performed, and should not even be attempted.

The objective is to establish and maintain an organizational structure that will provide for sound, systematic planning by local citizens which will have continuous influence on the action programs of the various agencies, organizations, institutions, and government units as well as firms, farms, and individuals.

Such an undertaking requires thorough agreement and commitment among all levels of an Extension

organization and an allocation of time for mastery of the necessary concepts. USDA has clearly given Extension the responsibility for the success or failure of such citizen planning organizations.

Some essentials of the organizational leadership role as performed by the Wisconsin Extension staff are:

1. Support from the county governing board of Extension agent time spent in this activity.
2. Commitment to and understanding of the specific organizational leadership responsibilities on the part of the county Extension staff.
3. Commitment and understanding from the members of the county Technical Action Panel as to the total process, Extension's organizational leadership role, roles of other agency personnel and professional staff from other sources.
4. Understanding among professional planning agencies, personnel on local planning boards, and top leadership among other agencies and institutions in the county.
5. A complete written design for the organizational structure and the detailed procedures for establishing and maintaining it.
6. Chairmen and secretaries trained in the roles they are to play for com-



*The Walworth County Extension staff receive training on their educational-organizational responsibility in total resource development from Extension Resource Development Leader, R. B. Schuster.*

mittees and subcommittees or study groups.

7. Adequate facts in a usable form provided to study group or subcommittee chairmen.

8. Professional or technical consultants available to each study group or subcommittee. All such consultants must be trained in their relationship to the study group and the total planning process.

9. A clear procedure for channeling information to the central group responsible for communications from the citizen committee as a whole.

10. Clear procedures for relating recommendations to action agencies or groups.

11. Regularly established review, evaluation, and up-dating procedures.

12. Adequate publicity and recognition.

Extension must be responsible for a great deal of education if all these conditions are to be realized. To repeat, however, the focus of all such education is on the development and operation of an effective citizen organization. In this context, then, one could use the phrase "educational and organizational leadership" as one.

### **Educational Leadership Role**

Extension is responsible for another educational leadership role, however.

Extension has vast technical resources that can be applied to the recommendations of the organization it has fostered. Many of the educational projects that the agents develop should be based on the total resource development plan. Extension must see that a thorough and accurate analysis of the problems and needs is available.

There has been relatively little criticism of Extension's educational leadership role. It is a role that most Extension staffs are familiar with, are well prepared for, and have been performing well. Any censure of this role has generally been that Extension's educational programs have not related to the recommendations of the citizen committees.

To the degree that this is true, one must assume either that the resource development planning committees did not do an adequate job of analysis or that Extension did not seriously consider their recommendations. If the former is the case, one must review the quality of organizational leadership that was provided for the citizen planning organization.

Planning for total resource development involves the organization of local citizens from throughout a county or area into groups which will do a sound and thorough job of:

1. surveying and studying all resources of the area—human, natural, and man-made;

2. providing sound recommendations for improving or developing these resources;

3. seeking or initiating action to carry out recommendations.

Extension's organizational leadership in this field must be strengthened. Such leadership is one of the most challenging assignments for Extension educators. It can also be one of the most rewarding experiences, if they master the concepts involved and accept wholehearted responsibility. Extension's effectiveness may be measured by the evidence of change and progress in the community, on the farms, in the homes, in the institutions, in the business firms, and among individuals.

People make the right decisions about policy and about change when they have the full facts about a situation and understand the implications. There is an opportunity, especially through this organizational leadership role, for Extension to provide the leadership the land-grant universities are capable of. This whole process is one of setting the pattern for the future. That is surely the challenge for Extension leadership in the coming decade. □



# City Youth Visit the Farm

*for unique experience in human relations*

by  
Josephine B. Nelson  
*Assistant Extension Editor*  
and  
William Milbrath  
*Associate State Leader*  
*4-H and Youth Development*  
*University of Minnesota*

"Hey, I got to ride a horse and chase the cows home!"

"We had the most fun of all—we held the baby pigs!"

"Boy, I didn't like the smells of that farm at first!"

These were some of the excited bits of conversation as inner-city youth from disadvantaged families in the Twin Cities found their seats on the buses taking them home after a 2-day visit on southern Minnesota farms.

August 1967 marked the third year of the city-to-farm people-to-people program sponsored by the Minnesota Extension Service in cooperation with Pillsbury Citizens' Service of Minneapolis.

Participating in the program each year have been 25 to 30 teenagers and several adults from the neighborhood served by the Pillsbury Settlement House. The farm phase has involved 4-H members and their families in a rural Minnesota community.

It was a quiet, almost apprehensive group of 25 Minneapolis teenagers who boarded the bus for Faribault County for a visit to strange farms, with people they had never seen.

The first stop was Blue Earth, where 4-H members and their families took their city guests to a corn-on-the-cob feed. Before long, the city teenagers were right at home, laughing and talking with their rural friends, trying to outdo each other in eating the steaming, buttery corn.

Next came a tour of a canning company, an ice cream plant, and a number of farms. One was a honey farm where the city youngsters saw hives of bees, found out how honey is processed, and were treated to crackers and honey.

Some misgivings returned as the city boys and girls were assigned to their host families for the evening meal and the overnight stay. But the warmth and friendliness of the rural hosts made such feelings vanish quickly.

The biggest thrill of all was in store—the opportunity to watch the varied farm activities and to help with farm chores, whether it was to feed the chickens or a newborn calf or simply to look in wonderment at the mysteries of a milking machine.

While the teenagers from Minneapolis were having the time of their lives on Faribault County farms, a similar group from St. Paul was enjoying the hospitality of farm

families in Winona County. This program was conducted for the first time in cooperation with the North Central Voters' League of St. Paul.

The city-to-farm program began in 1965 when a group of disadvantaged youngsters from Minneapolis visited farms in Lyon County. The following year Otter Tail County asked to continue the project.

County Extension agents help plan and conduct the activities for the visit. A staff member from Pillsbury House and North Central Voters' League makes arrangements for the city phase of the program. The liaison for the two groups is a member of the State 4-H staff.

Many civic groups and industries have been involved in the program. The Minneapolis Lions Club, for example, financed the bus transportation for the Minneapolis teenagers; in St. Paul, the Retail Store Employees Union, Local 789, furnished the transportation.

Although the project has been limited to two days, it has helped develop a deeper understanding of race relations in both city and farm youth through living, working, and playing together. The program also gives young people from the city a better understanding of farm life and how the food they eat is produced.

Equally important are the lasting friendships that spring up. Many of the young people have exchanged letters since the event. Whole families became involved when some of the rural family hosts arranged to meet the families of their city guests during the Minnesota State Fair.

The warm hospitality and friendliness of the rural families particularly impressed the city teenagers. "To be totally accepted by strangers was a unique experience for our youngsters," one of the city adult advisers remarked. "This is one facet of rural life not found in a big city."

This is the format of the Minnesota plan:

—The young people from the city and their adult advisers travel by bus to and from their destination.



—The 4-H members, their families, and representatives of other groups in the program meet the group from the city at a central location, get a run-down on activities planned, and begin to get acquainted with each other.

—Everyone then goes on a tour of several farms to learn about farming methods, equipment, animals, and 4-H projects. They also visit food processing plants and other local industries.

—A picnic lunch provides a break in the middle of the tour.

—In mid-afternoon the guests from the city go home with their host families for the evening meal and help with the farm chores. Later in the evening, the guests attend a 4-H meeting with their host families.

—In the morning the guests are included in the farm chores before a mid-morning departure.

Participants in the city-to-farm people-to-people program feel that its success the last three years warrants its continuation. Being considered, however, are some adaptations: extending the stay in the rural community to a 3- or 4-day visit; making the program a 2-day ex-

*Many of the children saw—and held—baby pigs for the first time in their lives. "I'll never eat bacon again," one of the boys declared.*



change with a group of 4-H members as guests of city families and agencies; and involving inner-city churches, boys' clubs, and public housing projects, as well as settlement houses.

Comments of the young people involved no doubt that the city-to-farm program has extended their horizons.

"I had never seen a pig before," commented one inner-city youth.

"Only a few of our group had ever been on a farm before, and none of them had taken part in farm activities," said one adult adviser. "The group was most impressed by the fact that farming is actually a very modern way of life."

Most amazing to adults observing the workings of the program was, as one expressed it, "In putting these two groups of young people together, no one seemed to notice difference in skin color, ethnic background, or religion. They seemed only interested in each other as individuals. The total program provided an excellent lesson in human relations for young people and probably more so for the adults participating and those observing from the sidelines." □



*Getting a chance to help with the milking was the reward this city boy received for getting up early.*

It's the "first of a kind" in the Nation. A new self-contained mobile trailer bearing the insignia, "Homemaking Unlimited," is touring Nebraska as a display and demonstration aid to help the approximately 53,000 physically limited homemakers in the State more easily perform their homemaking tasks.

"Homemaking Unlimited" will have visited 15 high population counties in Nebraska during 1967. Programmed through the Extension Service, the unit is expected to visit all areas of the State at a later time.

The program was initiated as the result of the enthusiastic planning and "salesmanship" of Dr. Virginia Trotter, Associate Dean of the College of Agriculture and Home Economics at the University of Nebraska.

Dean Trotter says, "Many men and women are released from a hospital where they have had a successful rehabilitation experience only to find that they have trouble adapting it to their own home and family."

A grant from the Nebraska Heart Association to the School of Home Economics Department of Family Economics and Management was used to purchase and equip the mobile unit.

The unit provides opportunities for persons to try out specially constructed, energy-saving kitchen work centers, learn to operate food preparation tools using only one hand, and work with a cleaning closet featuring easy-to-see, easy-to-grasp cleaning equipment.

A display of clothing shows ways of adjusting to crutches, easy-to-manuever closures, and other helpful ideas. Slides are used to show mothers with physical limitations easier and more workable ways of caring for children. All of the ideas can be simply adapted in the individual's home.

This "teaching laboratory on wheels" travels directly to people with cardiac disabilities, arthritic limitations, visual impairments, wheel chair restrictions, and other physical handicaps. Miss Alice Burton, consultant

## Homemaking Unlimited

by  
Mrs. Janet Huss  
*Information Specialist*  
and  
Agnes L. Arthaud  
*Assistant Director*  
*Home Economics*  
*Nebraska Extension Service*



*Two county Extension home economists arrive at the "classroom on wheels" for the one-week training program which preceded the unit's statewide tour.*

in homemaker rehabilitation in the School of Home Economics, works as an effective technician, teacher, and capable driver.

Agnes Arthaud, Assistant Director, Nebraska Agricultural Extension Service, is in charge of field programing, while the county home economics Extension agent serves as coordinator during the two weeks the unit is in her county.

The initial planning conference in each county is held six weeks to two months prior to the date the unit is scheduled for programing in that county. The technician, an Extension supervisor, and a representative of the Department of Family Economics and Management attend this session to help the home agent develop plans and explain the project to an Advisory Committee.

The composition of this Advisory

Committee is important to the success of the programs. The home agent contacts representatives of the medical profession, health-related agencies, and community groups including county Home Extension Council and clubs. This committee accepts the responsibility for assisting with arrangements for public showing and contacting physically limited homemakers.

Before the initiation of the "Homemaking Unlimited" program, 17 home agents from the most populous areas and counties in Nebraska were selected to attend a 3-day training conference in July 1966. This session was designed to prepare the agents for programing, and to acquaint them with the nature and extent of the problems physically handicapped persons meet in carrying out their homemaking responsibilities.



Representatives of health-related agencies, medical and nursing professions, volunteer health-related groups, Extension specialists, as well as representatives of the resident and research staffs in the School of Home Economics participated in the workshop and assisted with the training.

Staff for the conference included Mrs. Julia Judson, registered physical therapist and home economist at the University of Vermont, medical doctors, a social case worker, the Director of the Division of Rehabilitation, an occupational therapist, and research staff from the departments of Food and Nutrition and Family Economics and Management.

Homemaker consultations—individual planning conferences by the technician and home agent with handicapped homemakers—are an integral part of the operation of the “Homemaking Unlimited” program. Homemaker referrals are made by county leaders. Home Extension club members, too, have been particularly active in contacting physically limited homemakers and families.

The enthusiasm of Home Extension Club members was demonstrated in the case of Mrs. Arvon Jensen, a polio victim from Hall County. Mrs. Jensen said, “Without the encouragement of my Extension club I would never have visited the unit.”

Since the Jensens were building a new home at the time, Mrs. Jensen explained, “I had the contractor exchange the stove we were planning for one with a lower top, and the grab bars and shower head displayed in the unit were real additions to our bathroom arrangement.”

Other Nebraska homemakers have been enthusiastic about the program, and many physically limited women across the State have made adaptations in their own homes.

Followup visitations and consultations are handled by the county home agent, Family Economics and Management staff, Extension specialists, and local therapists and professionals in the community.

Group programs as well as individual consultations are included in the county program. These group programs have been held in every county to acquaint the general public with the extent of problems of the physically limited and the nature of assistance available to the handicapped and their families in improving homemaking skills and facilities.

More than 6,000 persons in eight counties have attended 117 group meetings. In most counties these meetings include a program and tour for Home Extension clubs and councils, civic groups, high school home economics classes, nurses, hospital staff, builders and the general public.

These groups see a film made with handicapped Nebraska homemakers, hear a discussion by the trained technician, and visit the unit.

The unit has also reached 200,000 other persons through such events as

the Nebraska State Fair, the Lincoln Health Fair, State Tractor Safety Day, State Home Extension Council Meeting, State Conference of Welfare Workers, Rehabilitation Association, and National Grasslands Conference.

Agnes Arthaud, Assistant Director of Nebraska Agricultural Extension Service, summarized the results she has seen to date from the Homemaking Unlimited program:

“In addition to its vital assistance to the physically limited, the program has opened channels of communication and understanding between Extension home economists and professionals in health-related organizations and agencies, as well as with civic groups.”

Miss Arthaud feels this program, designed to aid the physically limited homemaker, may lead to other cooperative programs in the future. □

*Among those who pooled their resources for the mobile demonstration unit are, left to right, the NU School of Home Economics Consultant in Homemaker Rehabilitation, the Grand Island Occupational Therapist, and the Hall County Extension Home Economist.*





# From The Administrator's Desk . . . by Lloyd H. Davis

## What Is Your Job?

At the recent convention of the National Association of County Agricultural Agents, Arden Burbidge, manager of Burbidge Farms, Park River, North Dakota, presented a talk with food for thought for all Extension workers. I recommend it for your reading.

Taking some liberty with interpretation, it seems to me his message to the county agents was something like this: You can be a switchboard operator, through which people are connected with sources of pieces of information they seek—or an appointment secretary—or a booking agent for the specialist. Or you can strive to be a walking encyclopedia and have on the tip of your tongue answers to all the specific technical questions you might be asked. In either case you will be busy, useful, and appreciated.

Or you can serve in the role of helping people answer questions of principle—and frequently people asking for pieces of information really want the principle. You can deal with principles in the technical and management phases of farming, in agricultural policy, in marketing, in other interests of the farmer. In this case you will be greatly challenged, will have the satisfaction of assisting the leaders in agriculture and will be respected as a man of great insight and good judgment.

Or you can go another step and deal with the big issues that are critical to America's "great agriculture," making a contribution to future greatness of our agriculture. Here my interpretation of his words ends.

Of course, most agricultural agents cannot serve exclusively in the latter roles. These are not exclusive alternatives. Agents must be able to answer and get answers to specific questions. But I share the view that they should help people learn principles and apply them—

improving their abilities to make decisions—also that they should focus attention on the big issues and opportunities.

How about the rest of us—those with other program assignments within Extension's total responsibility? Does Mr. Burbidge's message apply to us?

Should all of us be devoting an important part of our talents to helping people with the larger, more significant questions of principle, of policy, of goals, of direction—while we also help them with the essential details of the problems and questions with an immediacy today?

Should the agent specializing in 4-H-youth work be concerned with developing great opportunities for youth and helping each develop his own greatness?

Should the home economist be helping families with the questions of principle, by working to develop the greatness of the American family institution and helping the families with which she works achieve their greatness—while helping with the details of better living now?

Should those working on community resource development—while helping people answer specific questions as they work to improve their communities—press for understanding of the principles, seek out and help people answer the large issues of policy and direction, work toward their vision of a great community?

In the field of interest of each specialist in agriculture and home economics, is there a group of important questions of principle, direction, policy of vital importance to their clientele in achieving greatness and to which these specialists should devote important attention?

If so and as we are doing these things, we are seeking to help people achieve greatness in major components of a great society. □